

Serial No. 09/817,225

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-4 are pending. Claims 1-4 are independent claims.

Claims 1-4 have been amended. Support for the amendments to independent claims 1-4 can be found throughout the originally filed Specification, for example, at least at page 9, line 15.

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that "evaluating accuracy ... indicating whether a plurality of items ... are accurate" is vague and indefinite. Applicant respectfully refers the Examiner to the originally filed Specification, for example, at least at page 12, line 9 to page 13, line 1 and FIG. 9. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-4 satisfy the requirements of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §112 are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over AAPA in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,009,412 to Storey et al. All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "a real estate business deal introduction information reception unit formed in a part of a computer connected to an electronic network, said real estate business deal information reception unit receiving real estate business deal introduction information from a registered member containing a plurality of items over said electronic network, said real estate business deal introduction information indicating a potential buyer of a real estate", and "a confirmation unit formed in a part of said computer, said confirmation unit evaluating accuracy of said real estate business deal introduction information and forming accuracy information, said accuracy information indicating whether contents of the plurality of items received by the business deal introduction information reception unit are accurate

Independent claim 2 recites, *inter alia*, "evaluating accuracy of real estate business deal introduction information provided from a user terminal connected to said electronic network over said electronic network indicating whether a plurality of items, which are included in said real estate business deal introduction information supplied from the registered member, are accurate, said real estate business deal introduction information indicating a potential buyer of a real estate".

Serial No. 09/817,225

Independent claim 3 recites, *inter alia*, "a real estate business deal introduction information reception unit connected to a network, said business deal introduction information reception unit receiving real estate business deal introduction information from registered members, said real estate business deal introduction information indicating a potential buyer of a real estate" and "an evaluation unit connected to said network, said evaluation unit evaluating the accuracy of said real estate business deal introduction information provided by registered members over used terminals".

Independent claim 4 recites, *inter alia*, "causing the computer connected to the network to receive real estate business deal introduction information provided by the registered member from a user terminal connected to the electronic network, said real estate business deal introduction information indicating a potential buyer of a real estate" and "causing the computer to evaluate accuracy of the real estate business deal introduction information and provide accuracy information indicating whether a plurality of items of said real estate business deal introduction information provided by the registered member are accurate".

Applicant respectfully submits that none of the asserted citations teaches or suggests at least the aforementioned features of independent claims 1-4. Thus, without conceding the propriety of the asserted combination, the asserted combination is likewise deficient.

In rejecting independent claims 1-4, the Office Action contends that Storey et al. teaches evaluating accuracy of information whether a plurality of items (some information) which are included in purchase information supplied from the registered member are accurate. The Office Action cites Storey et al. at col. 5, lines 8-10, 20-25, and 28-35 in support of this assertion. Applicant, however, respectfully disagrees.

Storey et al. at col. 5, lines 8-10, merely states "Alternatively, if the user gained access via an internet direct method, the CREDIT CHECK routine 140 may provide an inquiry screen requesting the user to enter his credit information". Storey et al. at col. 5, lines 20-25 merely states "At step 130, certain predetermined information is strip[p]ed off from the completed order form and sent to the credit check 140. Such information may be, for example, credit card number and dollar amount. This is because much of the information included in the order form is irrelevant to the person's credit, and the credit institution may be unable to handle the extra information. Furthermore, sending the least amount of information would expedite the credit check". Storey et al. at col. 5, lines 28-35, recites "If the CREDIT CHECK routine 140 result is negative, in step 150N the user is provided with a message to that effect. The program may then prompt the user to enter another credit card number or to exit. However, if the CREDIT

Serial No. 09/817,225

CHECK routine 140 result is positive, in step 150P the program proceeds to establish a communication link and places a PRODUCT ORDER, 160, with the product company."

Applicant respectfully submits that Storey et al. merely teaches that a credit check can be run on a user. A user can then place an order only when the outcome of the credit check is positive. If the outcome of the credit check is negative, Storey et al. merely teaches that the user is prompted to enter another credit card number or to exit. This "credit check" does not verify user input information, but merely determines whether or not a user has available credit on the account to which he or she wishes to charge the cost of an order. Thus, it merely verifies that the user has available funds with respect to the account number entered. Consequently, Storey et al. does not teach or suggest evaluating the accuracy of real estate business deal introduction information provided from a user terminal, or forming accuracy information regarding the real estate business deal introduction information.

Applicant respectfully submits that AAPA fails to add anything to the teachings or suggestions of Storey et al. that remedies the aforementioned deficiencies.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the independent claims patentably define the present invention over the citations of record.

Applicant believes that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action. However, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to such matters.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Serial No. 09/817,225

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 27 July 2006

By:   
Allison Olenginski  
Registration No. 55,509

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501